REMARKS

The examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search and for the telephone interview conducted on April 19, 2007. By this amendment, paragraph [120] of the Specification is amended. No claims are amended, cancelled, or added. Hence, Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, and 26-38 are pending in the application.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed January 31, 2007 is addressed hereinafter.

I.   SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because it is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9-11, 26-30, 32-35, and 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0055962 to Freund et al. ("*Freund*").

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Freund* and further in view of by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026573 to Park ("*Park*").

Claims 8, 31, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Freund* and further in view of by U.S. Patent No. 6,782,422 issued to Bahl et al. ("*Bahl*").

II.   INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview conducted on April 19, 2007. Mr. Aravind Moorthy represented the USPTO and the Applicants were represented by Daniel D. Ledesma and Christopher J. Palermo. In the interview, the Examiner and representatives for the Applicants reached an agreement that the foregoing amendment to the Specification overcomes

the foregoing 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection to Claim 28. Also in the interview, the Examiner and

representatives for the Applicants reached an agreement that Claim 1 is patentable over *Freund*.

III.   CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites:

A method of assigning a network address to a host based on authentication for a physical
connection between the host and an intermediate device, the method comprising the
computer-implemented steps of:
receiving, at a router hosting an authenticator process for the host, from a first server that
     provides authentication and authorization, in response to a request for
     authentication for the physical connection, first data indicating at least some of
     authentication and authorization information;
receiving, at a DHCP relay agent process of the router, from the host, a DHCP discovery
     message for discovering a logical network address for the host;
generating at the DHCP relay agent process a second message that comprises the DHCP
     discovery message and the first data; and
sending the second message from the DHCP relay agent process to a DHCP server that
     provides the logical network address for the host;
wherein generating the second message further comprises sending a third message,
     from the authenticator process to the relay agent process, that contains at
     least some of the authentication and authorization information based on the
     first data. (emphasis added)

Freund fails to disclose numerous features of Claim 1. One of the differences between

Freund and Claim 1 includes the above-bolded portion of Claim 1. *Freund* merely states that a

client request may designate a DHCP server as a destination address and that if the request does

not so designate, then a connection to the Internet is denied (paragraphs [0150] and [0151]).

In an embodiment, the above-bolded feature involves the authenticator providing or

"handing off" authentication and authorization information to the relay agent. *Freund* lacks any

teaching or suggestion of a "hand off" of authentication and authorization (AA) information

(e.g., element 236 in FIG. 2) from a first router process (e.g., authenticator 105 of FIGs. 1 and 2)

to a second router process (e.g., DHCP relay agent 103 of FIGs. 1 and 2), after which the second

process generates a message that comprises the AA information and a DHCP discovery message.

One benefit of this approach is that the "hand off" relieves the DHCP server from having to re-

authenticate the user as a condition for assigning an address. Because *Freund* fails to teach or

suggest the above-bolded feature or anything similar thereto, it is respectfully submitted that

Claim 1 is patentable over *Freund*.

IV.   CLAIMS 26-28

Each of the features discussed above for Claim 1 is present in independent Claims 26-28.

Therefore, Claims 26-28 are patentable for at least those reasons that Claim 1 is patentable as set

forth above.

V.   CLAIMS 3-8, 10-11, AND 29-38

Each of the features discussed above for Claim 1 is present, by dependency, in Claims 3-

8, 10-11, and 29-38. Because each of the dependant claims includes the limitations of claims

upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims

upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable.

VI.   CONCLUSIONS & MISCELLANEOUS

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: April 25, 2007

/DanielDLedesma/
Daniel D. Ledesma
Reg. No. 57,181

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1229
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076